F 904.71
G 484a

ANNEXATION.

THE IDEAS OF THE LATE WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

His Far-sighted Views of the Future Relations Between Canada and Our Country.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR—Soon after the late Secretary Seward had completed the purchase of Alaska, the late Senator Foote of Vermont invited the Hon. John Simpson, a Senator of the Dominion of Canada, to visit him at Washington. Senator Simpson (who died in 1884) organized the Ontario Bank of Canada with a paid-up capital of $1,000,000, which was afterward increased to $2,000,000, and he became its President. Senator Foote was one of the original subscribers to its capital, to the extent of $20,000, and held his stock until his death. The two Senators were intimate friends for a quarter of a century.

When in Washington Senator Foote invited Mr. Simpson to call with him upon Secretary Seward. He was introduced to the Secretary as an ardent and true friend of the United States and as one who believed in and desired the political union of the United States and Canada. The future of Canada was fully and freely discussed by the three gentlemen. Mr. Seward knew well that it was the policy of Great Britain to unite British North America under one Government, and that this was also the desire of the Government of Canada. He therefore assumed in discussing the question with the two Senators that Canada would complete the purchase of the claims of the Hudson Bay Company in Rupert's Land and that British Columbia would join the confederation. Mr. Seward said frankly that he purchased Alaska to prevent its purchase by England, thereby preventing the extension of England's coast line on the Pacific; also because he believed it would strengthen American influence in British Columbia if it was bounded on the north as well as on the South by the United States.

He began by describing Canada as a garter along our northern frontier, too long for its width to have any inherent strength, and worse than all, that it was already practically broken in many places—first, by the State of Maine, which commercially separates the Maritime Provinces from Quebec; secondly, at the boundary line between Quebec and Ontario, by the racial and religious antagonism which existed between the people of the two provinces; thirdly, by the bar-

57627

F 484a

ren waste extending from the eastern end of Georgian Bay to the Red River, and fourthly, by the Rocky Mountains, which separate British Columbia from Rupert's Land. He also described Canada as a fringe of settlements along our northern boundary. He asserted that the commercial interests of the Maritime Provinces would always be with our north Atlantic States, while those of Quebec would be with the four northern New England States; that the interests of Ontario would be with New York, Ohio and Michigan, while those of British Columbia would be with our Pacific States; finally that the interests of any province which might be organized between the Red River and British Columbia would be with our Northwestern States.

He was much more familiar, Mr. Simpson informed me, with the reports of the factors of the Hudson Bay Company and the Roman Catholic missionaries located throughout the Northwest Territories than either of the Senators, also with the reports of various independent travellers who had explored that vast region. He knew that wheat had been grown very successfully at Fort Garry, now Winnipeg, long before it was grown in Minnesota or Dakota, and he admitted the possibility of its being produced over a very large area extending far up into the valley of the Mackenzie River. (Sir Charles Tupper declared on the floor of Parliament that there are 250,000,000 acres of land fairly fit for settlement between the Red River and the Rocky Mountains in Canada, and Prof. Macoun, in his "Manitoba and the Great Northwest," estimates land upon which wheat can be raised at 200,000,000 acres.)

Mr. Seward expressed the opinion that the surplus products of that vast region could never be successfully sent to market by way of Hudson Bay and Hudson Straits, but would reach tidewater on the Atlantic by rail, the great lakes, and the St. Lawrence River. He also expressed the opinion that Canada could never maintain a successful railway system if her railways were strictly confined to the transportation of her own products. He called the attention of the Senators to the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Great Western Railway of Canada would be compelled to go into bankruptcy but for the traffic which they received from the United States.

The construction of a Canadian Pacific railway was discussed. Mr. Seward declared that in his opinion it would never be constructed by private capital nor without very large subsidies from the Dominion Government, and that if denied access to American traffic it could not even be operated without Government aid. He pointed out the fact that its only local traffic would be along the section between Fort Garry and the Rocky Mountains; that to build it would certainly unduly tax the resources of Canada. He predicted that Canada could not attract and retain even her per capita share of emigration from Great Britain and the Continent either as a British dependency or as an independent State, because development would always be much more rapid in this country than in Canada, and

that immigration always followed rapid development; that if Canada attempted to force the development of a large territory without a corresponding increase in population she would soon increase her per capita taxation to such an extent as to cause an exodus of her own people; that in this country, even with our war debt to pay, we should rapidly decrease our taxation per capita because of our rapid increase in population. He admitted that Canada undoubtedly had great and valuable mineral resources, but he declared that she must have a large increase in opulation before their development could be secured; that, for example, she could not sell iron in Europe at a profit and compete with England, nor sell it to us while we placed an import duty upon it. He called the attention of the Senators to the fact that in Canada coal had been found only in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and that the geological formation of the country was such that it was unlikely that any would be found elsewhere. (Since then lignite has been found in Manitoba and a fair quality of coal at the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains, and bituminous coal on Vancouver Island;) that England without coal would never have established her manufacturing industries, and that a new country without coal would find great difficulty in successfully establishing manufacturing industries upon a large scale in competition with England or the United States, both of whom have an unlimited supply well distributed over each country. He remarked that, owing to the superior quality of our coal, Nova Scotia coal did not go west of Quebec; that if a duty should be placed upon coal by Canada, to force it farther west, her own people would be compelled to pay it; that a tax on coal would seriously embarrass her railways, and steam vessels on the lakes and rivers, as well as her manufacturers, and that she must always buy corn, coal, and cotton from the United States. He reminded his hearers that the embargo placed upon anthracite coal, to prevent its purchase by blockade runners during our civil war, caused great inconvenience to the manufacturers of Canada; that to procure the lowest possible cost in the production of manufactured goods and the highest possible grade of workmenship there must be a systematic division of labor; that such a division can only be accomplished in large establishments; that to secure to the consumers the goods at a fair profit on the cost of production, the market must be large enough to maintain a sufficient number of such establishments to create a healthy competition among the producers; that it would be hopeless for Canada to compete in foreign markets supplied by England or the United States; furthermore, that if Canada attempted to force capital into manufacturing industries by a protective tariff, without a very large increase in her population, her own consumers would be obliged to pay the advance in price caused by the increased duty. He affirmed that in our large and constantly increasing market the cost of production would steadily decrease, compelling Canada to increase her tariff to meet each decrease in the cost of production here. He thought the outlook for an extensive manufacturing industry in Canada, either as a dependency

of Great Britain or as an independent republic, without a large increase in population, was far from hopeful; that the prosperity of the Canadian people was dependent chiefly upon the price of fish, white pine, and wheat, with barley and peas added in Ontario, and oats, hay, and potatoes in the lower provinces; that the area in which fruit could be grown was very small; that corn could not be successfully raised except in a small portion of Ontario, and, therefore, that Canada could never compete with us in the production, for sale in foreign markets, of animal food. He said that she was compelled to import from us the pork and bacon consumed in her lumber camps, and also the corn consumed in the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. Seward called the attention of his hearers to the fact that the population of the United States was eleven times greater than that of Canada, or, in other words, that our end of the whiffletree was eleven times longer than hers, and that each decade would show an increase of leverage in our favor (in 1890 the population of the United States was thirteen times that of Canada), making it more and more difficult for Canada to compete with us in any and every field of enterprise. He reminded the Senators that it would seriously affect her power to attract immigration; that with our large increase in population the development of our natural resources would be very great and our increase in wealth enormous; that in this respect our advantage over Canada would be even greater than it was in respect to population; that it would add immensely to our power to consume manufactured goods, which would give stability and increased value to our industrial investments, and also enable us to wisely produce a much larger variety of manufactured articles; that a large population like ours, with boundless resources, where wealth was rapidly increasing, would always attract the most enterprising, skillful, and ambitious in all the walks of life; further, that the rewards of skill and labor would always be greater in such a country than in one with a small population, where development was comparatively slow. He believed that we should draw from Canada the class she needed most, her best workers, best thinkers, and best organizers; that, for example, a valuable patent was worth more than eleven times as much in the United States as it was in Canada, because our consuming power per capita was greater than that of Canada and therefore Canadian inventors would come here to develop or dispose of their inventions. He affirmed that the value of a manufacturing establishment was dependent upon the number and wealth of its patrons, and therefore capital seeking investment in manufacturing industries would come here in preference to going to Canada.

Mr. Seward said he was pleased to observe that for many years Canada had been becoming more and more American; that she had never abandoned an American custom once adopted, while she had abandoned many English customs; that she had adopted a decimal currency in place of the sterling, the net ton in place of

the long ton, and that, more than all, Ontario had adopted our municipal system of township, village, town, city, and county councils; that the township elections and township councils were the schools in which the electors first learned to govern themselves and to assert their right to do so, and that the lesson once learned was never forgotten; that she had adopted the education of her children in public schools supported by the State, representation according to population and had abolished a State Church; that her commercial and fiscal policy, her railway system and her judicial system, were gradually being assimilated to our own simply because the people were becoming less English and more American in spirit, sentiment, and aspiration; that American leaven was doing its work gradually, but surely, in Canada. Mr. Seward derived great satisfaction from the fact that Canada had formed a Federal and not a legislative union, which was desired by English and Canadian conservatives; also from the fact that each province was to control its own local affairs through a Parliament or Legislature of its own creation, for the reason that it would educate the people to govern themselves in a larger sphere than a city or county Council, and because it not only removed all danger that a monarchical Government would ever be established in North America, should Canada become an independent State, but it assured a Government republican in form in all essential features. He asserted that Canada as a part of the United States would share in all the advantages of our immense home market and in all the benefits to be derived from the immense variety of our natural productions; that the value of her railway investments would not be at the mercy of our legislation; that the value of her fisheries would be immensely increased; that her great mineral resources would be rapidly developed; her arable lands would be occupied and cultivated; her water powers improved; her waterways enlarged; her railway mileage rapidly increased; the St. Lawrence River developed to its utmost capacity; her shipping would share in our coasting trade on the sea coasts as well as on the lakes; the per capita cost to her people of government would be reduced, and that the large increase in her population would cause an increase in the value of all her fixed investments.

Mr. Seward predicted that the development of our Southern States under intelligent free labor would be one of the commercial wonders of the world, and that our increase in wealth in the future would far exceed that of the past.

Addressing himself to Mr. Simpson, he frankly said that political union was the manifest destiny of Canada, and that he most earnestly desired it. He said that it would remove the causes most likely to produce irritation between England and the United States; that the longer Canada resisted the inevitable, the longer she would delay the development of her natural resources; the more capital she expended in costly public works, unless she had secured such an increase in population as justified the expenditure, the more deeply she would become involved; that if she attempted to compete with the United States in granting sub-

sidies to promote railway construction to induce immigration, she would add to the cost of government without any corresponding increase of revenue; that every increase in taxation would drive intending immigrants from her, and that those among her present population who were least attached to her institutions would leave her and come to us; that the young, ambitious, and courageous native-born Canadians, who were much more American than British, and who had no personal relations with the mother country, who were compelled to work out their own future, would not hesitate to leave her. In addition, he said that when she lost her population by the emigration of her own sons and daughters, depreciation in fixed investments would surely follow, which would make it still more difficult for her to obtain emigrants from across the sea; that the commercial interests of British Columbia in our Pacific States would become greater every year and far exceed her interest in the provinces east of her, and that if British Columbia withdrew from the confederation, it would surely collapse, or if one of the new provinces, to be formed between the Rocky Mountains and the Red River should be settled by people having no sympathy with Great Britain, left the confederation it would be dissolved; that if the racial and religious animosities existing between the people of Ontario and Quebec continued, and Quebec, who controls the mouth of the St. Lawrence, determined to leave the confederacy, nothing could prevent its dismemberment.

It was Mr. Seward's opinion that the racial and religious antagonisms existing between the people of Ontario and Quebec could not be healed unless there was an abnormal increase in the English-speaking population of Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick; that the French Canadians being more prolific than the English-speaking race, the French population in the three provinces would continue to hold the same relative position as to numbers, (unless overcome by immigration) and therefore could not be assimilated or Anglicized; that if the three maritime provinces, wearied by a constantly increasing rate of taxation without any corresponding gains, revolted and united with us, the other provinces would be obliged to follow their example; that sooner or later the garter must break in pieces, and each of the parts come to us as separate States unless Canada became an independent nation, and then arranged as a whole for the admission of all the provinces to the American Union, the enlarged nation assuming all the liabilities of both the contracting parties.

Mr Seward in strong terms declared, that in his opinion the United States would never negotiate another treaty of reciprocity with Canada, but would deal with her as a portion of the British empire so long as she maintained her present relations to Great Britain. Mr. Simpson was so strongly impressed with Mr Seward's emphatic declaration in this respect that he never had any faith that the negotiations which have since been entered into from time to time by the two Governments, would end successfully for Canada.

Mr. Seward did not use the terms political union or continental union, but annexation. I have made the change because the people of Canada are as we were before the war, ambitious, proud, and sensitive, and the term annexation offends them. They are ready and willing to discuss political or continental union, but the word annexation seems to them to imply humiliation on their part. Therefore I have ceased to use the term when discussing the Canadian question.

Upon Mr. Simpson's return from Washington he invited me to visit him at his home near Bowmanville, Ont., and there repeated to me the conversation with Mr. Seward. He had a marvelous memory, and, I have no doubt, gave me the words of Mr. Seward almost verbatim. He knew that I was an ardent admirer of the great Secretary, that I earnestly desired his nomination in 1860 at Chicago as a Presidental candidate of the Republican party, and as I thought him the greatest philosophical statesman of his time, it would give me great pleasure to learn his views as to the future of Canada. He knew that I intensely desired the political union of the United States and Canada, and would be pleased to obtain any new information bearing upon the question.

FRANCIS WAYLAND GLEN,

266 McDonough Street, Brooklyn, Jan. 14, 1893.

[*From the Morning Advertiser, Wednesday, Feb.* 22, 1893].

WILL CANADA COME IN?

The Importance of Annexation—How the Sentiment Grows.

To the Editor of the Morning Advertiser:

In this morning's Advertiser I read with pleasure your editorial entitled "Will Canada Come In?" Will you kindly give me space for a few facts which are of great importance in discussing the question of continental union or the political union of the two great English-speaking families who now occupy and control this continent? The Canadian Government, through the Imperial Government, began to negotiate as early as 1816 with the Government of the United States for the free admission of the surplus products of Canada into this market. Nothing having been accomplished in the direction of a treaty of Reciprocity in 1837, there was a strong movement in Canada in favor of political union. It was crushed by the Imperial Government. We were a slave-holding nation at that time and were not seeking additions to our territory which would increase the anti-slavery vote. Many of the leaders of the secession in 1837 were obliged to seek refuge in this country. The father of Mr. Ernest A. MacDonald, the manag-

ing editor of the *Sun* of Toronto, the organ of the Continental Union party, was among the number (Mr. MacDonald is now in New York and can be found at the Broadway Central Hotel), and the late William Lyon McKenzie and Dr. John Rolph. There was another strong annexation or Continental Union uprising in 1849, when such leaders as Sir Alexander Galt, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir David McPherson, Sir George Cartier, and Sir John J. C. Abbott, the successor of the late Right Honourable Sir John Alexander MacDonald as Premier of Canada, signed a manifesto in favor of political union with the United States. Continental union might have been consummated at that time but for the pro-slavery party in this country. The movement was so strong that the Southern leaders were alarmed and to prevent political union they forced President Pierce to enter into the Reciprocity treaty of 1854.

Reciprocity and our Civil War and the great debt we were compelled to create quieted the demand in Canada for political union, and not until prices of agricultural and manufactured products came down to a gold basis here after the panic of 1873, did the annexation sentiment in Canada *strongly manifest itself*. Those who had no hope of an early settlement of the question of political union began at that time to come here in very large numbers to reside, and now one-fourth of all living native-born Canadians are residents of the United States. The sentiment in favor of continental union has been steadily growing in Canada ever since 1873 and is now ripening very rapidly. Continental union can be consummated by July 4, 1896, unless the incoming Administration commits the criminal mistake of changing our fiscal policy toward Canada and continues the present bonding system. I am in constant communication with persons in all parts of the Dominion and know whereof I affirm. The annexation of Hawaii is a most important step for this Nation, but the political union of the United States and Canada is a hundred times more important to ourselves and all English-speaking communities throughout the world.

FRANCIS WAYLAND GLEN.

NEW YORK, Feb. 20.

A Reason for Opposing Canadian Annexation.

To the Editor of the Tribune:

SIR—In this morning's TRIBUNE you quote from an address of John Crerar, Esq., Q. C., of Hamilton Ont., delivered at Rochester, N. Y. Mr. Crerar is a clever lawyer, who holds a life appointment worth $5,000 per annum. Some years ago he was appointed by Sir Oliver Mowat Crown Attorney for the county in which the city of Hamilton is located. His office does not prevent his practising his profession. Of course he does not wish his life income disturbed by continental union. In this respect his head may be level. He prefers status quo to any change which will disturb his life annuity from so sure a paymaster as the Province of Ontario. He is a genuine loyal Canadian patriot of the first water. He admits that things are so bad in Canada that 1,000,000 of his countrymen have left for the United States. That terrible fact does not interest him half so much as his life annuity. He is a loyal patriot for revenue only.

FRANCIS WAYLAND GLEN.

NEW YORK, Feb. 23, 1893.